

REMARKS

Claims 2, 5 and 7-17 were previously pending in this application. Claims 2 and 12 have been amended. New claims 18-23 have been added. As a result claims 2, 5 and 7-23 are pending for examination with claims 2, 12 and 18 being independent claims. No new matter has been added.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Office Action rejected claims 2, 5 and 7-11 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The term “cardboard,” which lacked antecedent basis has been replaced with the term “stock,” which has an antecedent basis. Claim 2 has been amended to overcome this rejection.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2, 5 and 7-11 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Office Action rejected claims 2, 5 and 12-17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,704,479 to Barnett et al. (hereinafter Barnett).

Previously, Applicant amended the claims to recite the box is formed of a single sheet of stock and that the cable spool support is integrally formed within the box of the single sheet of stock. Applicant argued, based on that language, that the claims distinguish over Barnett because Barnett discloses an insert that is formed of a separate sheet of stock from that of which the box is formed. In order to more clearly distinguish over Barnett, Applicant has further amended the claims, as shown. The amended claims 2 and 12 more clearly specify that the box and the spool are a unitary construction. According to several dictionaries, the term “unitary” means “having the nature of a unit; whole,” “of the nature of a unit; not divided; united” or “having the indivisible character of a unit.” This term should therefore clearly specify that the box and the spool are the same structure, not two separate structures as are the box and insert described in Barnett.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action rejected claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barnett in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,382,510 to Gaffney et al. (hereinafter Gaffney).

Barnett does not disclose the unitary structure of claim 2, as discussed above. Even when combined with Gaffney, there is no teaching of that structure. Therefore, claims 7 and 8 which depend ultimately from independent claim 2 are not obvious for at least that reason.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

New Claims

New claims 18-23 have been added to further define the Applicant's contribution to the art. Independent claim 18 is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 12, upon which it is based. Dependent claims 19-23 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 18.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant acknowledges with thanks the indication of allowability of claims 9-11 if rewritten in independent form. In view of this paper, those claims are now thought to be allowable as written.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50/2762.

Respectfully submitted,
Gerard Cote, Applicant

By: 

Gary S. Engelson, Reg. No. 35,128
LOWRIE, LANDO & ANASTASI, LLP
One Main Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02142
Telephone: 617-395-7015
Facsimile: 617-395-7070

Date: May 24, 2004